



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

2

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/872,066	05/31/2001	Jyotirmoy Paul	50277-1557	2304

42425 7590 08/07/2006

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER/ORACLE
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110-1089

EXAMINER

SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 08/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/872,066

Applicant(s)

PAUL ET AL.

Examiner

Mohammad A. Siddiqi

Art Unit

2154

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 03 July 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 1-16

Claim(s) objected to: None

Claim(s) rejected: 56-63

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:


See Continuation Sheet.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to Applicants argument, Kanevsky fails to show the mobile application server operating as an intermediary for interactions between the mobile device and the application. The examiner respectfully disagrees Kanevsky discloses the mobile application server operating as an intermediary (104, fig 1, col 7, lines 10-40) for interactions between the mobile device (113, fig 1, col 11, lines 56-64, cookies) and the application (101, fig 1, col 7, lines 1-40, display mode message or characteristics and contents are requested via server 104).

In response to applicants argument, Kanevsky fails to show "while operating as an intermediary, the mobile application server enforcing the rules about how mobile devices are allowed to interact with the application wherein the application is relieved of the responsibility of enforcing the rules about how mobile devices are allowed to interact with the application", the examiner respectfully disagrees. Kanevsky discloses while operating as an intermediary (server is acting as intermediary between client devices and other applications such as websites, 104, fig 1, col 7, lines 10-40), the mobile application server enforcing the rules about how mobile devices are allowed to interact with the application (adapter server coupled with server contains the display parameters and adapter server transforms web pages received from the website via server, 104, fig 1, col 7, lines 10-40) wherein the application (101, fig 1) is relieved of the responsibility of enforcing the rules about how mobile devices are allowed to interact with the application (104, fig 1, col 7, lines 10-40). Similarly, Kloba teaches the mobile application server operating as an intermediary (col 5, lines 20-64; col 6, lines 3-36) for interactions between the mobile device and the application (please see discussion of fig 1U, col 6, lines 3-36); and while operating as an intermediary (please see discussion of fig 1U, col 6, lines 3-36; col 23, lines 5-7), the mobile application server enforcing the rules about how mobile devices are allowed to interact with the application (col 5, lines 55-64; col 6, lines 3-36) wherein the application is relieved of the responsibility of enforcing the rules about how mobile devices are allowed to interact with the application (col 5, lines 20-64; col 6, lines 3-36) .

In response to applicant's argument Kloba does not teach receiving, at a mobile applications server , registration data from an application , Examiner respectfully disagrees, Kloba teaches, receiving, at a mobile applications server (102, fig 1), registration data from an application (See client Registration Process, col 29, lines 6-64), wherein the registration data specifies rules about how mobile devices (col 23, lines 1-44) are allowed to interact with the application (col 23, lines 1-44; col 29, lines 6-9; col 6, lines 3-36);.


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100